

Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

DRAFT Summary Management Actions Workshop

Flood Fighting, Emergency Response & Flood
Recovery

July 23, 2010, 1:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.

Center for Collaborative Policy

815 S Street, First Floor, Sacramento, CA 95811

Participants: 30

Name	Organization
<i>Bair, Lewis</i>	<i>Reclamation District 108</i>
Blomquist, Nikki	DWR (FloodSAFE Communications)*
Booth, George	Sacramento County
<i>Brown, Jim</i>	<i>Cal EMA Inland Region</i>
Clyde, Eric	MWH*
Croyle, Bill	DWR (HAFOO)*
<i>Darsie, Bill</i>	<i>Reclamation District 2086/KSN, Inc.</i>
<i>Eckman, Jim</i>	<i>DWR, (FloodSAFE Environmental Stewardship and Statewide Resources Office)</i>
Eto, Jim	DWR (CVFPO)*
Fong, Sonny	DWR*
<i>Ford, Connie</i>	<i>Sacramento County Water Resources</i>
<i>Fordice, Steve</i>	<i>Reclamation District 784</i>
<i>Ghelfi, Pete</i>	<i>Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency</i>
<i>Green, John</i>	<i>Stockton East Water District</i>
<i>Heiland, Brian</i>	<i>DWR</i>
<i>Hill, Reggie</i>	<i>Lower San Joaquin Levee District</i>
<i>Hobbs, Jennifer</i>	<i>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</i>
<i>Johnson, Mark</i>	<i>Cal EMA Preparedness Division</i>
Jones, Christy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jones, Pam	Kearns & West (facilitator)*
Kei, Marti	DWR*
<i>Lopes, Jim</i>	<i>DWR*</i>
<i>Olsen, Randy</i>	<i>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</i>
<i>Sandner, Jim</i>	<i>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</i>
<i>Seligman, Keith</i>	<i>Kings River Conservation District</i>
Smith, Brian	DWR (DIRWM)*
Sutkus, Adam	CCP*
Thomson, Janet	Kearns & West (facilitation team)*
Tollette, Alex	MWH*
<i>Wegener, Terri</i>	<i>DWR (Statewide Flood Management Planning)</i>

*Workshop team

Italic = Attended via webinar

This summary only includes comments made during the workshop. Written comments submitted after the workshop will be available at <http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmfp>.

Comments and Questions on Draft Initial Management Actions

MA-069: Protect critical infrastructure corridors from flood waters

Summary: Flood Fighting, Emergency Response & Disaster Recovery Management Actions Workshop

Description/CVFPP Goals:

- Within this management action we should prioritize what we need to protect.
- This management action should include protection of hospitals, fire stations, police stations, communications centers for safety and dispatch (telephone, television, emergency services), and flood fighting materials (stockpiles).
- Clarify that protected water treatment plants should include stormwater, wastewater, and potable.
- This management action should consider protecting alternate transportation that may be used in a flood, such as vessels, boats, and others.
- We should consult with local governments about their existing evacuation plans to ensure that we are including their key transportation routes and other resources they plan to use in the event of emergencies.

Advantages/Disadvantages:

- Instead of "high capital cost," frame the cost in terms of relative cost/benefit.
- Another advantage of protecting infrastructure is that you prevent unnecessary evacuations in areas that would lose power or other fundamental services due to flooding in another area.
- Another advantage is the benefit to commerce if you protect key infrastructure. For example, maintaining cell phone service or maintaining major roadways between key population centers preserves commerce.

Economic Considerations:

- There is significant potential for cost sharing at a local level because the benefits of improving roads, water systems, and other infrastructure are shared by local governments. We should look for partners to share both the costs and benefits.
- There is a potential to cost share any time you put in hard structures. There are Delta levees projects and other DWR special projects, for example, which can contribute to costs of construction.
- If identified before construction, changes can be made to add protection as new infrastructure is built without additional, or at minimum additional, costs.
- There is a reduction in flood fighting costs if you make these infrastructure improvements since there will not be as much to protect.

Technical Considerations:

- There could be some redirected hydraulic impacts depending on what kind of improvements you do. If you make a levee somewhere or maintain a setback levee, depending on the situation, you could increase hydraulic impacts.

Integration with Other Programs:

- This could integrate with PL 84-99 from the Corps. There are advanced measures included if you know the flood is coming.

MA-070: Expand the State's assistance to LMAs during flood emergencies

Description/CVFPP Goals:

- The methodology section is too limited. A loan guarantee is often not feasible because of the time it takes. We need options that can be used in a matter of minutes. We should include the model used by CAL FIRE where there is a pool of money that can be tapped quickly in an emergency, or some other sort of emergency fund.
- Note that progress is being made within DWR on the emergency resources fund concept.
- Consider adding the option for LMAs to be pre-qualified for loans or grants. (This would have to include strict criteria regarding defaults.)
- Clarify that LMAs in this context refers to any agency with involvement in levee maintenance.

Advantages/Disadvantages:

- Another advantage is that to the extent that additional resources provide for a quicker flood response that will increase public safety and thereby reduce overall flood response costs (flood damage costs).

Economic Considerations:

- A majority of the critical infrastructure is owned by private companies so this management action should incorporate public/private partnerships (including privately owned utilities).

Summary: Flood Fighting, Emergency Response & Disaster Recovery Management Actions Workshop

- Additional resources that could be leveraged include the California Utilities Emergency Association, the former BENS (Business Executives for National Security) which is now called the California Resiliency Association, and the California Grocers Association (for resources such as ice, drinking water, food).
- The Corps has a non federal program for levees that allows LMAs to participate in PL 84-99 at an 80/20 cost share on recovery repairs.
- Delta Subventions has money but only allows \$50,000 per incident and a maximum of \$250,000 of funding.
- We need to increase up-front coordination across agencies to ensure that all requirements (e.g. environmental review) are met in order for funding to be approved. Close coordination occurred in 2006, and that may be a model to pursue for streamlined coordination across agencies and local governments.

MA-071: Improve evacuation planning

Description/CVFPP Goals:

- This management action should include coordination with local governments, including providing tools to assist with making decisions on ordering evacuations (e.g. mapping tools, vulnerability assessments).
- Add to the methodology that plans should consider communications and notifications, since studies show that 52% of homes no longer have land lines.

Advantages/Disadvantages:

- Provides increased coordination between operational areas and communities.
- A potential advantage is the reduced liability costs and insurance costs if we are becoming more effective at evacuating people and therefore having a decreased loss of life. Both local agencies and homeowners would benefit from decreased insurance costs.
- Another advantage for evacuation planning is that if local governments and special districts recognize they may be vulnerable to floods, they may increase their communications and coordination with the next level of government and widen their networks of available resources.
- We should use this opportunity to do a better job of educating the public about products and guidance available for flood response, emergency evacuations, closing of waterways, etc.

Social Considerations:

- There is a wide variation in degree of evacuation planning. For smaller urban, non urban, and tribal areas, there often are not planning staff. Many jurisdictions are not prepared and do not know where to send people. Cities and counties are ultimately responsible for dealing with incidents but there may not be adequate coordination, training, or resources.
- We should use this management action to promote coordination between tribal communities and local government. Communication lines should be established so tribal communities can request assistance when needed.
- Continued funding for these programs is essential to their success.

Integration with Existing Programs:

- The Corps of Engineers (via Baker Engineers) is implementing a mapping program in coordination with five Delta counties. If successful, this could potentially be expanded to other counties; FEMA is interested in taking the approach nation-wide as part of their flood hazard reduction program.
- Cal EMA Inland Region is working on an evacuation plan for the Delta. There will be a Golden Guardian exercise run in May 2011 to practice the approach.
- Smaller emergency management agencies that rely on cell phone service should consider using available services such as GETS (Government Emergency Telecommunication Service) that assure that phone networks will be usable during emergencies. For wireless networks they should consider using WEPS (Wireless Emergency Phone Service).
- The Naval Postgraduate School is assisting Cal EMA with data sets on evacuation.

Summary: Flood Fighting, Emergency Response & Disaster Recovery Management Actions Workshop

MA-072: Develop a post-flood recovery plan for the Central Valley and Delta to improve the coordination and efficiency of post-flood public assistance

Description/CVFPP Goals:

- This management action title should be modified to say “post-flood assistance” since “public assistance” generally refers to funding for public structures only. This management action should include federal, state, NGO, and private resources.
- Since the state has disaster recovery programs in place it could help to identify all types of assistance that would be needed in a flood scenario so we make sure we have programs in place for the Central Valley and the Delta and see if there are any gaps. This should take into account what exists, what programs are in development, and what future gaps are anticipated.
- In developing this management action, we should reference the document about public assistance that describes the program as it existed in 1997. It may provide a useful framework.
- This management action should consider the interaction needed across federal, state, and local jurisdictions to avoid incidences where recovery is hampered because relevant agencies do not have authority to perform the needed activities.
- This management action should seek to provide clarity about who has the authority to remove infrastructure installed during flood fights after the flood has receded.

Economic Considerations:

- We should explore public/private partnerships, especially since much of the critical infrastructure is owned by private entities.

Social Considerations:

- If the plan identifies who is responsible for removing infrastructure after events then various entities would understand their responsibilities and know the avenues available to them during the post-recovery process.

Integration with Existing Programs:

- Cal EMA recovery experts can assist with technical aspects of developing this management action.
- Cal EMA can provide recovery guidance to the local level.
- The Corps' PL 84-99 rehabilitation program can be useful.
- The Natural Resource Conservation Service does post recovery work.
- FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program may be relevant.
- The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has some block grant programs that may be useful.
- USDA, the Center for Disease Control (for medical-related issues), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have programs that may be relevant.

MA-073: Streamline the post-flood permitting process for flood system repairs

Description/CVFPP Goals:

- This management action is duplicative of the one discussed during the Permitting Workshop; it should be combined.
- Should be termed permit coordination rather than streamlining because most permits are mandated by law.
- Develop some type of permitting model for the locals to use and support.
- The fundamental need here is to have one-stop shopping for permitting.
- Under methodology, clarify that “Board” refers to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board.
- There may be gaps between emergency (mid-event) permitting and post-flood permitting.

MA-081: Purchase and position flood fighting materials in preparation for a flood event

Description/CVFPP Goals:

Summary: Flood Fighting, Emergency Response & Disaster Recovery Management Actions Workshop

- This action is already required by DWR for LMAs. This management action is more to increase amounts and sites where materials are stored by both DWR and locals. Management action should expand on what is already being done.
- This management action can help prevent competing for supplies between state and local agencies during an emergency.
- This management action should include all tools in addition to materials.
- This management action should be expanded to include reaching out to vendors and having them make commitments for supplying specific quantities of tools or materials, if possible. This is typically done in other industries.
- Note that DWR is investigating alternative flood fight materials and technologies, such as HESCO containers (currently used by the Corps), muscle wall technology, geocells, and others. DWR is also working with the Department of Homeland Security on levee breach rapid repair systems which may prove feasible.

Advantages/Disadvantages:

- This management action will be difficult in the Delta where there are few locations for stockpiles above the high water line. We may have to construct high ground in strategic locations to maximize our response.

Integration with Existing Programs:

- The Corps uses Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts to provide rock to specific areas. This contracting approach is currently difficult for the State to pursue, but as part of this management action the state should look into alternative contracting options.

Suggestions for New Management Actions

Title: Integrate environmental compliance into the flood fight.

- Description: Develop a process to ensure that environmental resources are integrated into initial flood risk planning and flood fighting activities in order to monitor existing conditions, make preliminary environmental assessments, and coordinate adequate notice to relevant resource agencies. Assign environmental compliance specialists to flood operations centers.
- Advantages/disadvantages: Advantages include improved cost recovery, increased or enhanced environmental protection, and expedited environmental assessments related to flood fights. The potential disadvantage is that the process could delay the flood fight response (though that may be handled through increased training and development).
- Economic considerations: There should be some interagency cost sharing with other local agencies involved in training and coordination.
- Social and technical considerations should mirror those under management action 70.
- Integration of other programs should include the Corps' non federal program for levees that allows them to participate in PL8499 at an 80/20 cost share on recovery repairs.